G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—20-12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

~~191~~ 1898-99
(Courts)

File No. ~~92~~ 117 of 1898-99

Serial Nos. 1–7

~~Papers Filed.~~

~~*Month*~~_____

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Narasimha, Judicial Emmasta, Magor for holding him responsible for the loss of property worth Rs 276.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Indexed. B. Venkatasubbiah Countermanded

Petition presented by Narasimhayya, Judicial Gumasta of the Nagadi Taluk is as follows:— (23. 5th Dy. Cumr's. No. 1011 of 25/12/00)

That on the 20th of March 1897, he placed in the Court property box at the Nagadi Taluk office certain gold and silver articles to the value of more than Rs 276.

That the box in question was secured in the Treasury Guard room in front of the

Date 8.24th May/00 from

Petition presented by

Gd Clerk

Robert this copy
requisite for.
Cannot you not have
made an abstract of the
Petition written
omitting anything
unnecessary

27/5/01

Literal translation
of the petn was
called for—

Rs. 286-8-4
in all.

the Treasury room ~~at~~ situated at a distance of 2 cubits from the former.

That the Treasury Guards were constantly patrolling the fence and were also guarding the box in question.

That on the 13th of April 1897, the petitioner, with the knowledge of the guards, opened the box and found that gold and silver articles to the value of Rs 276 were missing in the same.

That on a further examination he found that some of the articles placed in the box, were all scattered and that a chip of wood newly removed from the top of the box and some nails were also lying loose in the box.

That the petitioner instantly informed the Sheristadar and the Amildar of the circumstances, who readily came to the place where the box was lying and observing the whole, ordered the Police Inspector

t

to take immediate steps for the ~~recovery~~ detection of the lost property.

That a report of the above fact was also made forthwith to the Deputy Commissioner by the Amildar.

That thereon the Deputy Commr. in his no 1526 dated 19-4-~~98~~ 97 ordered that the Police should detect the lost articles & that the Gumastha should also be held responsible ~~for making good the value~~ of the missing property.

That in pursuance



Same date is inserted in the petn.

The Dr. Commissioner of 19.4.97 did not expressly authorise the recovery from the Gadi-Gunastah, but that officer did not object to such recovery when the same was subsequently reported to him by the Guilder.

of the above order, the petitioner was compelled to pay up the value of the articles amounting to Rs 276, which the petitioner paid in two instalments on 1-6-97 and on 4-6-97 - thereby his means of livelihood.

That the Guildar paid the above sum to one Balwantsing the guardian of certain minors to whom the missing articles belonged, and failed to take steps for

4

the detection of the
lost articles.

That subsequently the petitioner presented a petition through the Amildar to the Deputy Commr. who in his no 1834 of 24-6-97 ordered that the mere recovery of the amount from the Gumastha was not all that was expected from the Amildar & but that the & the Police Inspector should both understand that their responsibility would not cease till the lost articles were

found out.

That the lost articles which had been tested in the first instance both in colour and weight by the Panchayaldars in presence of the Amildar, were all tied into a single bundle in a piece of white cloth which the Police had originally used for the same purpose.

That in the said bundle articles worth only Rs 10-8-0 and which could not have been extracted through the hole, were left strewn, while the rest of the articles

amounting

amounting in value to Rs 246 & which could have been removed ~~from~~ two the said hole, were made away with.

That the then Amildar saw that the box was damaged by the loosening of a long existing slit at the top, by the recent removal of a chip of wood as therefrom and that the said piece of wood, nails pinetted to the box, a bamboo stick &c, were also strewn loosely into the box together with the thread of the cloth, which had stuck into the chip of wood while removing the articles from the box.

W. Trimaldar clear (since returned as "Extra copy. Cross of mistake mk)

That the Panchayatdars placing another bundle into the box, attempted to take out the contents thereof through the widened hole and finding that they were successful in their attempt finally said in their mahazar that a theft was really committed.

This was only their surmise.

That from the 2nd up to the 13th of April there were two batches of guards. Of them one batch consisting of seven watched from the 1st to the 5th ins Saul- and the other, of police keepers

watched from the 6th
to the 11th as the bearer
sepoys had escorted
the Treasury to Bangalore.

That the bearer sepoys returned on the 11th and while taking charge on the same date, one of them by name Thimma observing the widened hole at the top of the box informed the Havaldar of the same. That the aforesaid fact has also been recorded in the deposition of Thimma.

That the petitioner did not open the box

This statement of Thimma has been discredited in the subsequent Police investigation.

till the 13th of April as he had ~~[illegible]~~ during the interval not received any articles to be put into the same.

That the petr brings to the notice that the theft of the articles referred to, must have been Committed either by the Baroo Sepoys or by the Police in charge of the room.

That although 17 months have elapsed ever since the commission of the theft, yet no property has been traced.

That further the

Police

Police have submitted
a Report stating that
it is not possible for
them to find out the
articles lost.

That a perusal of
the records together
with an examination
of the articles found in the box
viz. chips of wood,
loosened nails &c.
(still preserved) is
prayed for.

That a copy of the
endorsement given to
him by the Amildar, ordering that no refund of the money paid by the Petr could be made,
is herein enclosed for
kind perusal.

That the poor petitioner has paid with great difficulty a large sum of Rs 276 to Govt. as ordered by the Deputy Commr., but that he is at a loss to know whether the Taluk authorities will hereafter take any steps to find out at least the missing property.

That the petitioner humbly submits that it is unjust that he should be held responsible for the loss of property

property from the Court box in charge of the Treasury Guards.

That a perusal, the petn. submits, of the entire correspondence, will convince the Authorities that the levy of the aforesaid amount from him is not legal.

That under the above circumstances the petitioner humbly prays that an order may be kindly passed for the refund of the

money paid by him.

Submitted.

21/1/04.

Sub. Inspector

In my humble opinion the guilty Simantah has been rightly held personally responsible.

He says that he placed the property in question in the Court box on the 30th March 03 in presence of Mashalchi Ranga and Golan Krishna

I Mentd to Govt
11.

shooting but the latter
have denied this in
the course of the Police
investigations.

The gunsmith had
access to the log again
on the 2nd April/99 when
he opened it to put in
more property and there
is nothing beyond this
to show that statement that
the missing property
was intact then.

The log was replaced
by the gunsmith
on the 13th April when
the log was opened. It
have been tampered with.

The circumstances
of the case reflect
grave suspicion on
the Gymnastick but it
is a question whether
the responsibility for
the boys should not
have also extended to
the two Guardians
Mr - Tirumalachari.
The latter has naively
admitted in his first
report to the Dy. Comm-
on
the case that a slit
wide enough to admit
3 or 4 fingers together

Yes but what the
Gymnastic
retired did
is too late?
Can any action
against him
lie?

appeared to have
existed in the lid
of the box for a long
time previously as
it was in fact
this is certain
after arrangements
were made for safe-
-guarding the property
committed to his
charge. He did
not make it a daily
practice to see that
the missing property
was actually placed
in the box on the 30th
March 97, or that it
was all right when

the bag was re-opened, re-sealed again
re-opened on the
2nd of the month
following. In fact
under latitude ap-
-pears that the
Giunta the Quaestor
who had the key of
the bag in his own
hand, sealing the
bag sometimes
with the Tabularius key
seal & sometimes
with the seal of the
Tabularius Statius Iadeus.
During the interval
between the 30th March
and the 13th April [illegible]

The Court a change
of Treasury Guard
from the Bank to the
Police and back
again to the Bank,
but even these
precautions neither
the Guildhall nor the
Sheriffs deem took the
trouble to see that
the box left in the
Grand Jury room was intact.
In his report of 23/11/99
the Asst. Comm. in charge
suggested to
the Dy. Comm. that
a separate safe box
may be supplied to the

Taking Court at Kings
for custody of
valuable articles."
No notice has ap-
-parently been taken
of this suggestion.

AJ 1/2/01

Faxed to 2810.

Rec'd 4/2/01
1028

2/2/01

4/2/01

Edward Lee
Reason & interfere

2/2/01

Medical Ref
6/2/01

Faxed proof to HP
6/2/01

Submitted to the Dewan.

Jud^l Sumasta (Naraz Sunhaya) of Nagadi seeks a revision of the order of Govt^t on the ground (chiefly) that he was not heard. The records were perused and ~~both~~ the ~~Secy~~ 1st Councillor ordered that there were no grounds to interfere.

That the Petr^r misappropriated the property has not been apparently proved or even suggested. If he was responsible, the Amt^r was more so; but he was not made liable — apparently because he had left the Place Rs. 276 is a very large sum for a sumasta to be paying it without consideration & may mean his sum

I do not know however whether it is open now to reinvestigate the case.

4/7/1901

Rec'd
4.7.01
1135

(Papers recalled from D.O.H.O. in connection with further representations from the same individual. The file may now be ret'd. for submission to Secretary. 10-12-01)

A further petition since received is herewith submitted.

11/12/1901

43.5
I cannot interfere in this matter

25.11.02

27/3

Draft forwarded
26/8/02

Subd.

(1) Two Rs. Stamp affixed: Scaffo

(2) The petr has produced the order of the Asstor. of 23-6-98 & not the order of the Dy. Comr.

MK
7/11/98

Petr is repd by the Notary No of 1883 under wh he shd submit his petn through the Departmental head

My 10/11/98

Endt on petn
Cbn
13/11
P
Endt despd
17/11/98

1898.

No. 891

Name of Petitioner Narasimhappa
Judicial Gumasta

Village

Taluk Magadi

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 31. 10. 98

Date of Receipt 3. 11. 98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

SECTION Sub

FILE No. 92 of 1900-01

SERIAL No.

ABSTRACT

Magadi Amildar's Endt: No 673 dated 23-6-98 to the petitioner runs thus:—

"It is the duty of the Judicial Gumasta to carefully take after the articles received in criminal cases. Though the box containing the articles was placed before the Treasurer under the supervision of the guard, the Gumasta should have now and then examined it & checked the contents thereof. The box

The box was not examined from the 2nd to 13th April- On its examination subsequently the fact of certain things having been missing was brought to light and information thereof was given to the Police who have taken steps in the matter-

Under these circumstances the Gumasta's request praying that the amount should be paid by Govt: cannot be accepted- The Police have been written to trace out the culprit- The Gumasta should also endeavour to find out the man"

The circumstances of the case are as follows:-

The petitioner who is a Judicial Gumasta in Nagadi Taluk placed a box containing unclaimed property, in a room where the taluk treasury guards patrol, which is a distance of 2 cubits

2½ cubits from the Entrance to the treasury & which is at all times open to the observation of the guards. On 13.4.91 when the petitioner opened the box with the permission of the guards he found that silver and gold articles of the value of 276 rupees, which were secured in the box on 30.3.91 were missing therefrom. He also found that the lid of the box had been handled. Inside the box were seen a small piece of wood & nail while the other articles were scattered here & there. This, the petitioner brought to the notice of the Muldar & the Shenastedar, who on seeing the same directed the Police to trace out the offender and reported the matter to the Dist. Magistrate for orders. The Dist. Magistrate on his

order No. 152 of 19.4.98 directed that the petitioner's responsibility as regards the lost articles cannot cease & that the Dacoity should be traced out. Thereupon the petitioner being afraid of the loss of appointment & the enforcement of the Distt Magistrate's order, by the Amildar raised a loan & paid the amount in two instalments on 1.6.97 & 4.6.97. The Amildar paid the sum to the parties but did not take steps to find out the lost property and reported the matter to the Distt Magistrate. The Distt Magistrate in his order no 1839 of 24.6.97 informed the Amildar that the mere recovery of the amount from the Gumasta was not what was expected & that the Amildar & Police Inspector were held responsible for the detection of the crime. The petitioner states that

Out-

3/ out of the lost articles which
were all tied up in a cloth,
after being Estimated by
the panchayetdars in the
presence of the Amildar &
secured and the box by giving
the bundle a distinct number
property valued at Rs 10-8-0
was left in the box as the
opening made in the lid
was not sufficiently large
to remove them also that
the Amildar has seen
the piece of wood and nails
that braces of cloth being
forcibly Extracted from
inside the box were noticed
by Amildar & panchayetdars
on the occasion of drawing
up a Mahazar as some
strings of the cloth were
seen stuck up to the inner
pieces of wood; that from
1st to 6th April the Bar Sepoys
were guarding the treasury;
that Police peons were placed
to guard the treasury from
6th to 11th as the former accompanied
the Remittance (to Distt Rs 2

that when the Bar keepers returned and took their charge on the 11th one of them brought to the notice of the Havildar that the lid of the box appeared to have been handled that a Bar keeper has deposed to that effect that the Sergeant had no occasion to go near the box as he had neither to remove from nor to store in it anything from the 2nd to 13th that though it is over 17 months no attempt at detection has been made that the Police have now submitted a report that he does not expect that the lost property would be detected -

Prays that with reference to the entire records equitable orders may be passed as subjecting the petitioner to this loss which was due to the carelessness of the Guard is not just -

Enclosure.

1. Magazine Havildar's Evidence.

5-11-98.

673 of 23-698

Refer
15/6/00

891 98

Refer petn

16-6-00

7

1900

SECTION

FILE No.

SERIAL No.

No. 2244

Name of Petitioner Narasimhaiya

Village Judicial Branch

Taluk Malavalli

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 22-5-00

Date of Receipt 28-5-00

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one

Subd

may the petr- be submit his appeal through the Dy Comr

25/6/00

Endt on petn

26/6

2000 Copies

27-6-1900

ABSTRACT

States that he appealed to. on 1-11-98 affixing two-rupees Stamp to his petn praying that Rs 276/ which had been recovered from him in a case of theft in the Taluk treasury may be ordered to be refunded; that this petn was returned for being submitted through the Official Superior; that when he accordingly petitioned the Amildar, correspondence ensued between the Divl Asstt Comr at Closepet & the Dy Comr, resulting in the issue of the following Endt to the petr (No. 22 dy 22-5-00) from the Amildar conveying the Dy Comr's order:-

P.T.O.

"This occurred during the time of the late Ds. Com^r. The then Ds. Com^r, the amildar, and Asst^l Com^r who inspected the shot. mention that they cannot but hold the Jud^l Gumasta responsible, and that it is reasonable to recover the amount from him. In the enquiries which I (Ds. Com^r) made in person, I have come to know that the Gumasta had great responsibilities. Therefore, at this distance of time, I see no reason to interfere in the matter."

Pet^r now appeals against this order of the Ds. Com^r as conveyed to him by the amildar and prays that orders may be passed after perusal of the records.

Sec. Taluk Regd 13 No. 330 of 22/5/00

13/13 - 6-00

OD 14/4

#° 2244.

MYSORE DEWAN'S O[illegible]
PETITION DEPAR[illegible]
REG'D No 2244R
DATE 28-5-900

By Post registered
28.5.00

to Secretary

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 276 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (200) [illegible]

[illegible] 1/11/1898 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 12/11/1898 [illegible] 891 [illegible]

[illegible] 19/11/98.

30/6/[illegible]

① ರಾಜ್ಯ ಅಬಕಾರಿ [illegible] 89/[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ರಾಜ್ಯ ಅಬಕಾರಿ [illegible] 22/5/00 [illegible] 330 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ದಿ 24/5/00

[illegible]

[illegible]

Enclosure No. 8

330 08

Ghulam Jilani

22-5-00

23/5/00

Refee
13/7/00
2244 of 99 Refe patch

13

1900

SECTION 1 No. 74

FILE No. 99 Name of Petitioner Narasimhaiya

SER'AL No. 80 Village Dod-Gumasta

Magadi

Taluk

District Bangalore-

Date of Arzi 9-7-00

Date of Receipt 11-7-00

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2

Sub
16-7.

MK
18/7/00 Pet-r to be refd. to the previous enst

Enclosures
CM
20/7.

Dy 19/7/00

20000 Boys
21-7-1900

ABSTRACT

With refee to this office Endt- No. 2244 dy 26.6.00 directing him to submit his appeal through the Dy. Comr, the pet-r states that his first appeal to this office was on 1-11-98; that on receipt of this office Endt- No. 891 dy 12.11.98, he submitted a pet-n to the Dy. Comr, through the Amildar, praying that records in his case might be sent to Govt-; that although 1½ years have elapsed since then the Dy. Comr has been sending the file back to the talukh only; & that if the pet-r shows

should again repeat his prayer to the Ds. Comrs, he fears that Office might send the records back again to Talbot Office as before.

Prays that the Govt may be pleased to call for the records directly from the Ds. Comrs, and pass equitable orders in the matter.

Enc. (1) Previous Petn to Govt 15th Inst
(2) Enc. to the above (Talbot Encl. No 330 of 22. Sept 30)

J. 7855

6976

(General Serial No. 30.)

27.11.00 1900/1907

From The District Magistrate
Of the Bangalore District

SECTION 2 & *To* The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Rev & Genl Depts

FILE No. G.J. 01/2000-01

SERIAL No. 1.

Dated 25th } December 1900.
Despatched 26th }

Received

General No. } 190 .
D No. 1011

Enclosures Number. one file

Subject Records connected with the case of Narasimiah Judicial Amanta, Nagar Taluk, and his appeal against the order of the Dy Commissioner holding him responsible for the loss of property worth Rs 2716/ left in his custody

Prob
27-12-00.

Recd
3/1/01

Vb

D No. 1011
Encl: one file

Office of the District Magistrate
of the Bangalore District
Bangalore 25th December 1900.

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore —
Revenue Genl Department.

Sir,

One Rukma Bai who was living in Magadi died in 1897 leaving three minor children — (1 male and 2 females). Her property was taken charge of by the Police and handed over to the Taluk Magistrate for safe custody. The property was placed in the Court property-box on the 30th March 1897. The box was placed in the guard room — in front of the Taluk Treasury and its Key was in the custody of the Judicial Gumasta Narasimhaiya. He had

had no necessity to reopen the box till the 13th April 1897. In the interim there were two changes in the guard, that is from the barr to the police and from the police to the barr. When the judicial punnasta opened the box on the 13th April 1897, he found gold and silver ornament and other articles to the value of Rs 276/ missing. He at once made a report to the Amildar who on examination reported the entire circumstances to the District — magistrate. The then District magistrate Mr. V.N. Narasimmiengar stated that the responsibility of the judicial punnasta did not cease by his mere reporting. On this authority the then Amildar magistrate Mr. M. A Thirumalacharya recovered from the judicial punnasta the value of the missing articles viz Rs 276/ and paid it to the guardian of the minors. The judicial punnasta — protested against this. Steps were taken to

to trace the missing articles but in vain. The guards were examined but to no effect. The Judicial Gumasta admitted before Mr. B. J. Kumarasami Naik, Asstt Commissioner Magistrate of Closepet that since the time he took charge of the office of Gumasta there was a hole in the lid of the box sufficient to admit of two fingers and stated that the property might have been removed by enlarging the hole. Mr B. J Kumarasami Naik who held a local enquiry opined that the Judicial Goomasta was primarily responsible for the property and that there was no course left but to recover the cost from him. On this report the then District Magistrate Mr K. P. Puttanna Chetty decided that there was nothing for him to interfere in the matter. This was Communicated to the Judicial Gumasta by the Taluk Huildar. The gumasta now appeals to ~~—~~ Government against the order of the District Magistrate and I beg to submit to ~~Government~~ his appeal ~~petition~~ as per order left by Mr Puttannachetty together with the records of the Case.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

District Magistrate
Bangalore District

26-7-1900

11-12-1900

Recd 14.12.1900

May be forwarded with report

27-7-38

Submitted

Supdt

[illegible]

[illegible] 276 [illegible]

[illegible] 24/4/00 [illegible] 1342 [illegible]

330 [illegible]

[illegible] 26/6/00 [illegible] 2244 [illegible]

[illegible] 330 [illegible]

[illegible]

23/7/00 [illegible]

Pro of the Ct. of Mepore

SECTION 6(5) Revn

FILE No. 92-05-01

SER'AL No. 5

Letter No 1011 dt 25 Dec 90 from the Dy Comr Bangalore Dist reporting submitting the appeal petition of one Narasimmiah, Judicial Gumasta, Magadi Taluk against the order of the Dy Comr, Bangalore Dist, holding the Petnr responsible for the loss of property Rs 276/- left in his custody, & subg. together with the records connected with the case.

Order No: 105-19 dt 14-2-1901
J 1141

The Govt are of opinion as that they do not see any reason to interfere with Appellt the order of the Dy Comr. in the appeal preferred already passed in the matter.

for Secy.

Dft
M.R.
6/2

To The Dy Comm, Bangalore
mdb
7/2 returning enclosures &c

appealing against which Rs. 276/- being the value of certain rice property left in the appellant's charge has been recovered from him.

The appellant will be informed accy

DK 11/2/01.

J 1392.21

order on the petition:—

Petition Branch.

Subj P. N. K

28/5/01

J.

Transferred to Judicial Branch

1.6.01

Rec'd 7/6/01

Refers put up. MB 10/6/01

190/

No. 2555

Name of Petitioner Narasimhia, Judicial Gumasta

Village

Taluk } Magadi

District Bangalore

SECTION 1-7.

FILE No. 92 F 1901-02

SER'AL No. 6

Date of Arzi 25-5-01

Date of Receipt 30-5-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure One

Submitted. to Secr

The facts are discussed in the notes below, ending with the Cr's order of 5th Feb 1901.

It is a question whether any notice should be taken of this petition

12-6-01

Rec'd 12/6.

ABSTRACT

This is an application for review of Govt order No. 10519 / J.1141 dated 14-2-01 in re the recovery from the petitioner of the value of certain missing property left in his charge.

The petitioner states that he was not heard personally and that he does not know why Govt see no reason to interfere; and that the

MGCPB—23-3-01—3,000.

2V

order now prayed to be reviewed does not state it distinctly.

He prays for proper order after the reperusal of the entire records.

Reg
31/5/01

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಎಲ್.ಎ.ಡಿ.

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು
ಮಂಗಳೂರು ಉಪವಿಭಾಗ
ಮಂಗಳೂರು

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಮಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಕಸಬಾ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಮಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಕಸಬಾ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದೆ.

I ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಮಹಜರ್ ಕಲಂ 4(1) ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ದಿನಾಂಕ 13/4/1974 ರಂದು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದೆ (ಅನುಬಂಧ-1) ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣದ ವಿವರಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

2 ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 1.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

3 ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಹದ್ದುಬಸ್ತು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ನೆಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

4 ಈ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ [illegible]

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಎಲ್.ಎ.ಡಿ. 555 ಮಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಕಸಬಾ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಮಂಗಳೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಕಸಬಾ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದೆ.

I ಈ ಕಚೇರಿಯ ಮಹಜರ್ ಕಲಂ 4(1) ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ದಿನಾಂಕ 13/4/1974 ರಂದು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದೆ (ಅನುಬಂಧ-1) ಸದರಿ ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣದ ವಿವರಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

2 ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 1.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 555/1 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0.10 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

3 ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಹದ್ದುಬಸ್ತು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ನೆಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

4 ಈ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ [illegible]

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೃಷಿ ಇಲಾಖೆ/ಸಂಶೋಧನೆ/2021

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 25/5/2021

ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಿಗೆ ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರಗಳಿಗೆ ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸಲಹೆ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಹುದ್ದೆ — ಸಂಶೋಧನಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರ — ಭೇಟಿ ನೀಡಬೇಕಾದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕೃಷಿ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು

Enclosure 6 & 6.

Proceedings of the Govt. of Mysore

Read

"Letter No. 1011, dated 25th December 1900, from the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District, reporting on the petition of one Narasimhia, Judicial Amasta, Anekal Taluq, appealing against the order of that officer, under which Rs 276/- being the value of certain missing property left in the appellants charge, have been recovered from him and submitting the records connected with the Case.

Order thereon, No 10519 in 1 File J 1141

Dated Bangalore 14th February 1907. Government see no reason to interfere the appellant will be informed accordingly

(Signed) H Ramanujayengar

for Secretary

25

Anjaneya District-District

Magistrate's Office Dt: Bidadi 16th

February 1907

8378

308.

No 1020

17 file

Copy is forwarded to the

Amildar of the Maladi Taluq with

the records for information and

Communication to the Appellant

(Signed): B. K. Venkata Varada Iyengar

Dy Commissioner of

Bangalore

(Copy)

407

15/2/1907

Draft

SECTION XX No. 1613

FILE No. 9207-57 13/7

SER'AL No. 7

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

The 31st March 1902

ENDORSEMENT GRANTED TO Narasimhiah

Judicial Gumasta, Nagar Taluk

in reply to his repeatedly Petition Registered No. 2555 & 1592 dated 25th May 1901 applying for review of Govt order No 10579 dated 14th February 1901, declining to interfere with the orders of the Dyecour, Bangalore regarding the recovery from him of certain property left in his charge.

Petitioner is informed that Government cannot interfere in this matter

By Order,

for Secretary
4/4/02

16147
J. 1398.

Copy to the Dyecour, Bangalore D.O. for perusal.